





City of Loma Linda Official Report

Floyd Petersen, Mayor
Stan Brauer, Mayor pro tempore
Robert Christman, Councilmember
Robert Ziprick, Councilmember
Charles Umeda, Councilmember

COUNCIL AGENDA: May 24, 2005

TO: City Council

VIA: Dennis R. Halloway, City Manager 

FROM: Deborah Woldruff, AICP, Community Development Director 

SUBJECT: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NOS. 02-02 AND 02-05, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NOS. 02-02 AND 02-05, SPECIFIC PLAN (SP) NOS. 02-08 AND 02-13 (UNIVERSITY VILLAGE AND ORCHARD PARK)

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is for the City Council to continue this project to the June 14, 2005 meeting agenda after hearing presentations of both projects by staff and the applicants, and opening the public hearing to take public testimony.

BACKGROUND

On November 4, 2004 and November 18, 2004, the Historical Commission reviewed the two projects for compliance with Chapters 17.80 and 17.82. The Commission approved Certificates of Appropriateness for both projects with extensive recommendations to ensure that the end goals are met: preservation and protection of historical resources and the character of the Historical Mission Overlay District area. The recommendations of the Historical Commission are available in Attachment 1.

The Planning Commission reviewed the two specific plan projects and environmental documents in ten meetings and one public workshop over a period of six months from October 20, 2004 to April 20, 2005. On April 20, 2005, the Planning Commission forwarded the items to the City Council with recommendations for certification of the Draft Final Environmental Impact Report and approval of the General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes and Specific Plan documents. However, the Planning Commission's approval of the two projects includes a list of recommendations that are quite extensive. A listing of their recommendations is available in Attachment 2.

ANALYSIS

Original Requests

The original request is to change the General Plan Land Use designations from the Business & Research Park (with Support Uses), Elementary School, and Community Park to the Mixed Use designation. There is also a request to change the Zoning Maps from Single-Family Residence (R-1), General Business (C-2), and East Valley Corridor Specific Plan Special Development and Public Institutional to Planned Community (PC) to accommodate the adoption of two specific plans (University Village and Orchard Park), and future subdivision of 308 acres into 677 single family units, 1,760 multi-family units, 591 mixed use residential units, and 675,118 square feet of commercial space, 459,558 square feet of commercial/office within mixed use, and 15.7 acres of institutional, 19.7 acres of park land, and an elementary school. The project site is located north of Mission Road, south of Redlands Boulevard, east of the Edison Easement, and west of California Street.

Section 2.0 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) contains a more detailed Executive Summary of the two projects (previously distributed).

Revised Requests

The revised requests still include the General Plan Amendments, Specific Plans, and Zone Changes. However, the revised requests result in a reduction of the overall density for both projects by a total of 531 units and a net decrease of 18 percent. The total number of units for University Village is 1,507, which includes mixed-use units and multi-family and single-family residences. The total number of units for Orchard Park is 990, which includes mixed-use units and multi-family and single-family residences.

Copies of both revised Specific Plans will be distributed to the City Council on Monday, May 23, 2005 and made available to the public.

Planning Commission Review

The Commission reviewed the two projects extensively before forwarding them to the City Council with recommendations for approval. As mentioned, the Commission's recommendations are lengthy and are reflective of their review efforts. In concept, the Commission liked the layout of the specific plan areas, but had concerns about density in terms of placement and the total number of units. The recommendation is that the overall density of both projects should be further reduced and that densities at the south end near Mission Road be much lower than those placed near Redlands Boulevard. As a further illustration of the recommendation, the Commission required that lot sizes on Mission Road and in the vicinity of that roadway be a minimum of 8,000 to 10,000 square feet. The Commission also recommends that the projects not include small lot subdivisions unless the units are attached. The lot sizes would become smaller and the density higher in a northward direction. The highest densities would be established in the vicinity of the commercial uses that would be established along Redlands Boulevard. The residential density for both projects would not exceed 4.5 dwelling units per acre and the calculations would not include nonresidential acreages. Based on the 4.5 densities the number of

units permitted would not exceed 1,300 dwelling units. The revised projects actually propose a total of 2,497 units for the residential and nonresidential (mixed-use) areas, which exceeds the densities recommended by the Planning Commission for the two projects as well as for the Draft General Plan, Special Planning Area D.

The Planning Commission was aware of the inconsistencies between and felt that this is a policy issue could only be resolved by the City Council. A potential resolution of the issue would be to calculate the units in strictly residential areas at 4.5 dwelling units per acre and by a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.6 for residential units in nonresidential areas. This provides the opportunity for additional vertical residential units to be placed above commercial or office uses in mixed-use areas. Consideration may also be given to the inclusion of horizontal mixed uses with portions of residential units placed at the rear (and above floors) of storefront units. This option would allow some of the additional units that are proposed by the applicants. The FAR provisions for residential units in mixed-use areas would need to be included in the Draft General Plan for Special Planning Area D.

For the University Village project, the Commission required that the high-density residential uses be more integrated with the commercial uses so that there is no clear demarcation line. The applicant is evaluating how this can be accomplished in a revision to the Specific Plan.

There are several other issues for which the Commission made specific recommendations including requirements for four-sided, authentic historical architecture; limiting the maximum building height in residential areas to 1.0 or 1.5 stories for detached units; and, preserving in place the Coastal Oak Trees by placing a center median in Rhonda Street wherever feasible. Staff will provide more description and analysis of these issues for the meeting on June 14, 2005.

ENVIRONMENTAL

In October 2001, the City Council determined that both projects should be analyzed jointly in one environmental document for consistency and cohesiveness. The City retained the services of RBF Consulting to prepare a joint Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for both projects in April 2002. The CEQA mandatory 30-day public review period for the Notice of Preparation (NOP) began on September 21, 2002 and ended on October 21, 2002. A public Scoping Meeting, held on October 10, 2002, helped to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, methods of assessment, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth. The written comments received during the NOP public review period were used to determine the environmental scope and copies are contained in Appendix J of the DEIR.

On April 2, 2004, the NOP was redistributed due to several project delays that resulted in an eighteen (18) month time lapse. The DEIR was completed during the latter part of August 2004 and released with the Notice Of Completion and Availability (NOC/A) for public review on September 8, 2004. Pursuant to the CEQA, the 45-day public review period for the NOC/A began on Wednesday, September 8, 2004, and ended on Friday, October 22, 2004. The comments received during the NOC/A public review period are contained and addressed in the Draft Response to Comments document. Copies of the Draft Response to Comments document have been distributed to those persons and organizations that submitted comments during the public review period.

The Draft Final Environmental Impact Report will be distributed to the City Council on Thursday, May 26, 2005 and made available to the public.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Other than the costs associated with the preparation of the Draft Final Environmental Impact Report and revenue from the sale of the City's land to Lewis Operating Corporation, the financial impacts of the University Village/Orchard Park Specific Plan Projects are not known at this time. However, staff anticipates that the collection of plan check fees, building and construction permits, and Development Impact Fees for future projects within the Specific Plan areas will be substantial.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Certificate of Appropriateness Findings and Historical Commission Recommendations
2. Planning Commission Recommendations (to be distributed on May 24, 2005)
3. Draft University Village Specific Plan (to be distributed on May 24, 2005)
4. Draft Orchard Park Specific Plan (to be distributed on May 24, 2005)
5. Draft Final Environmental Impact Report (to be distributed on May 26, 2005)

I:\UV-OP\Staff Reports\City Council\CCSR 05-24-05.doc

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
FINDINGS AND HISTORICAL
COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS**

FINDINGS

Historic Preservation Findings

A Certificate of Appropriateness may be adopted only if any one of the following findings is made:

1. *With regards to designated resources, the proposed work will neither adversely affect the significant architectural features of the designated resource nor adversely affect the character of historical, architectural, or aesthetic interest or value of the designated resources and its site;*

The Historic Commission reviewed the proposal and identified several historic structures on the site (i.e., Helen Hinckley House, Frink Adobe, and Nat Hinckley House). The recommendation was to relocate some structures to the Heritage Park. The Frink Adobe will be restored, preserved and maintained in situ in the Citrus Historical Park with proper markers and identifications to protect the historical significance of each individual building. Additionally, the commission also required that the mature native trees be either protected in place or relocated near the historical buildings, with the California State licensed arborist's evaluation and guidance. Approval of the Historic Commission's recommendations and implementation of the conditions of approval and mitigation measures will ensure that the proposed specific plan projects will not adversely affect the character of historical, architectural, or aesthetic interest or value of the resources and its site.

2. *With regard to any property located within a historic district, the proposed work conforms to the prescriptive standards and design guidelines for the district adopted by the commission, and does not adversely affect the character of the district;*

The proposed project identifies architectural type, style, and character that is consistent with the common architectural styles found in the area from the early 1900 era. The University Village and Orchard Park Specific Plans identify the standards (architecture and landscape) with detailed design guidelines to maintain consistency with the character of the area and the previously adopted Historic Overlay standards and requirements. Therefore, this project will not adversely affect the character of the district.

3. *In the case of construction of a new improvement, addition, building, or structure upon a designated cultural resource site, the use and exterior of such improvements will not adversely affect and will be compatible with the use and exterior of existing designated cultural resources, improvements, buildings, natural features, and structures on the site; and*

The proposed specific plans identify designs that are in keeping with the architectural styles found in the area. The Historic Commission has recommended reuse and reutilization of the original construction materials (e.g., adobe bricks, bunk house mantle, fire place material, etc.). The Commission also recommends that the old Mission School

be preserved and maintained in situ and the existing coastal oak trees in their original locations. Therefore, the new improvements to the project site will be compatible with the existing cultural resources in the area.

4. *That strict application of standards does not create an economic hardship based on testimony and evidence supplied by the applicant whereby it is judged by the commission and city council that strict application of the guidelines would deprive the owner of the property of all reasonable use of or economic return on, the property.*

The proposed projects identify the relocation of some existing structures, restoration and preservation in situ of other structures, preservation and relocation (as necessary) of existing mature trees, and reuse of building materials, as appropriate. The preservation in situ and/or relocation of such structures will provide many opportunities for the developer and the City to preserve the history and heritage of Loma Linda. This process, by providing more flexibility in design, will create a better functionality for a planned community to service the future residents and patrons. With better design opportunities, the project will yield better products that ultimately result in a positive economic return. Therefore, the strict interpretation of the guidelines will not cause any economic hardship to the applicant.

UNIVERSITY VILLAGE/ORCHARD PARK SPECIFIC PLANS HISTORICAL COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

UNIVERSITY VILLAGE SPECIFIC PLAN

On November 4, 2004, the Historical Commission held a public hearing on the University Village Specific Plan Project and made the following recommendations as part of their approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

1. Guachama Rancheria – The exact boundaries of this resource have not been clearly delineated. It is presumed that the resource is located near the westerly boundary of the University Village project area. There is an existing marker in this vicinity. The applicants propose to develop a Heritage Park on the southwest portion of the project area. The Heritage Park would be developed in conjunction with the City of Loma Linda to provide sanctuary for the relocation of historical residences from the Mission Historic Overlay District. Further to the north of this park would be a Senior Apartment Community. A significant buffer would be provided between the park and the senior development. The existing historic plaque could be located to the Heritage Park. Mitigations can be required that an archeologist be on-site during any excavation and if any historic artifacts or bodies are discovered during excavation, that immediate action should be taken for notification of proper authorities and preservation.

***MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL
THAT THE HERITAGE PARK BE INCREASED IN SIZE TO AT LEAST NINE ACRES
(COFFMAN/STARK; CARRIED – 6 YEAS/0 NAYS/0 ABSTENSIONS/3 ABSENT)***

2. Mill Creek Zanja – Due to past floods in the area, the Zanja has been buried approximately 4-7 feet below the current surface. The Zanja on Mission Road Report provides information on the location of the Zanja within University Village project area. The Zanja is located approximately 80 – 100 feet north of Mission Road and runs along almost parallel to Mission Road. The applicants propose an interpretive recreation of the Zanja within the Heritage Park or the Frink Adobe Park sites. An excavation of the Zanja within the Heritage Park would provide an educational resource within the park. The Zanja would be identified with a trail that would include stone bollards, split rail fence, way-finding markers, Shade trees, and benches. The project includes a Mission Road Historic Corridor within the location of the Zanja. It had been previously discussed that this area would be an appropriate location for a greenbelt along Mission Road. The applicant has proposed an alternative to the plan as described, which would include preserving the Zanja at its exact location between within the Mission Road Historic Corridor. Instead of the greenbelt, large homes on wide lots, similar to the south frontage of Mission Road would be located adjacent to Mission Road. Access to these 11 homes would be from Mission Road. This would allow the Zanja to be preserved in place.

MOTION TO REQUIRE THAT EXCAVATION ON THE ZANJA SHALL BE LIMITED TO THREE FEET IN DEPTH (STARK/COFFMAN; CARRIED – 6 YEAS/0 NAYS/0 ABSTENTIONS/3 ABSENT)

3. 25964 Mission Road (Stone Carriage House) – The location of the Stone Carriage house and the Stone arch is within the proposed Heritage Park site. The applicant has indicated a preference to keep the two structures in place as part of the Park amenities. The location of the Stone Arch may require the Mission Road right-of-way improvements to be designed specifically around the arch, due to the close proximity of the arch to Mission Road.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

4. San Bernardino-Sonora Road/Mission Road – Mission Road right-of-way will be improved in accordance to the design specifications approved by the City Council. These improvements include the center median and landscaping, except in front of existing residences. The proposal includes anchoring the two corners of the University Village project area along Mission Road with the Heritage Park to the west and the Frink Adobe Park to the east. Between the parks within the Mission Road Historic Corridor would be a greenbelt. This greenbelt would be planted with citrus rows along the road edge. The proposed plan proposes no homes fronting along Mission Road, except for those existing homes. A trail is proposed along the 2-3 rows of citrus along the road edge.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

5. 26013 Redlands Boulevard (Victorian Farmhouse) – This residence is vacant and has been boarded up by the property owner. The land plan shows that the area where this house is located is proposed for condominiums. The applicant would like to either move this house to the Heritage Park or demolish the structure. The EIR indicates that the elements of the setting in this building's historic integrity would be significantly compromised even if the building were physically preserved in place, unless the project design is revised to provide for a substantial buffer zone around the building. The relocation of this building to the Heritage Park would be a much more compatible setting.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the mitigation. However, the structure was fire damaged on November 3, 2004 and subsequently demolished a few days later.

6. 26251 Redlands Boulevard (Cole Ranch Residence) – This residence is occupied and currently owned by the City of Loma Linda. The large, two-story Queen Anne-style residence is reportedly the largest grove house remaining in the City of Loma Linda. The land plan shows that the area where this house is located is proposed for neighborhood shopping center. The applicant would like to move this house to the Heritage Park. The EIR indicates that preservation would be best accomplished if the project design can be adjusted to avoid compromising either its location or

setting by establishing a historic park at its current site. If this is infeasible, the Cole House should be relocated to the Heritage Park.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed that the Cole house should be relocated to the Heritage Park.

7. 26100 Mission Road (Opal Van Leuven House) – This structure is owned and occupied by the Lamb family and not proposed for modification. Any future development on this lot would require Historical Commission review and City Council review and approval.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

8. 26122 Mission Road (Earl Tunnel Residence) – This structure is owned and occupied by the Samoya family and is not planned to be altered. Any future development on this lot would require Historical Commission review and City Council review and approval.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

9. 26150 Mission Road (Richard Van Leuven House) – This structure is owned and occupied by the Lambert family. There is no proposal to alter the structure. Any future development on this lot would require Historical Commission review and City Council review and approval.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

10. 26154 Mission Road (Helen Hinckley House) – The structure is very dilapidated and should be evaluated by a historical architect to determine if there is any structural integrity remaining in the building. The land plan shows that the area where this house is located is proposed for single-family neighborhood and a portion of the Mission Road Historic Corridor area. The applicant proposes to demolish the structure. After evaluations by a historical architect, if the structure is determined to be structurally unsound, it may be appropriate for demolition. If the original structure is found to be structurally sound the Draft EIR indicates that with proper restoration, the house has the potential to regain its original qualities and significance within the district. If determined to be structurally sound the structure could be relocated to the Heritage Park. The two large redwood trees adjacent to the structure that appear to have been planted at the time of the building construction are also proposed to be removed by the applicant.

A large shed is located directly to the west of and adjacent to the Helen Hinckley House. Contrary to popular belief, the so-called “bunkhouse” has never been used as a bunkhouse. The bunkhouse that was once on this property, located farther to the west, was demolished at least 40 years ago. The primary use of the building was equipment storage since the early 1930’s, which is consistent with the physical features of the building. There are two small rooms in the structure that have

remnants of decorative trim of Spanish/Mexican motif. It is likely that the trim was Helen Hinckley's own artistry. The applicant proposes to demolish this structure.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT THE REDWOOD TREES BE IDENTIFIED ON THE PLANS AND PRESERVED IN PLACE IF POSSIBLE; THE MANTLE AND OTHER HAND PAINTED ELEMENTS OF THE BUNK HOUSE BE PRESERVED AND SALVAGED FOR DISPLAY; DESIGN FEATURES IN THE GARDEN, WHICH INCLUDE THE FIRE PLACE, SHALL BE PRESERVED AND SALVAGED IF POSSIBLE; AND, DOCUMENTATION SHALL BE COLLECTED ON ANY STRUCTURE OR DESIGN FEATURE WITHIN THE HELEN HINCKELY PROPERTY (DIGNEO/COFFMAN; CARRIED – 6 YEAS/0 NAYS/0 ABSTENSIONS/3 ABSENT)

11. 26210 Mission Road (Stephen Ramirez House) – This structure is owned by Stephen Ramirez and occupied by tenants. There are no plans to alter the structure. Any future development on this lot would require Historical Commission review and City Council review and approval.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

12. 26220 Mission Road (Milton Frink Residence) – This structure is owned by the Frink family and occupied by tenants. There are no plans to alter the structure. Any future development on this lot would require Historical Commission review and City Council review and approval.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

13. Tractor Barn (Used for Storage) - To the rear of the Milton Frink Residence is a shed structure made of wood and metal. It is known as the Tractor Barn and was built in the mid 1930's by Milton Frink for servicing the citrus groves. The applicant proposes to demolish the barn. However, it may be appropriate to relocate this structure to the Frink Adobe Park, which will be a citrus-dominated cultural park.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT THE TRACTOR BARN SHALL BE RELOCATED TO THE CITRUS HISTORICAL PARK IN WHOLE OR IN PART (STARK/COFFMAN; CARRIED – 6 YEAS/0 NAYS/0 ABSTENSIONS/3 ABSENT)

14. 26234 Mission Road (James Stocker Residence) – This structure is owned and occupied by the Stocker family and is not planned to be altered. Any future development on this lot would require Historical Commission review and City Council review and approval.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

15. 26248 Mission Road (Frink Adobe) – This adobe residence is owned by the City of Loma Linda, managed by JJ Ramirez Citrus Management Company, and occupied by tenants. The residence is one of the best-known historic buildings in the City. The

structure is proposed for in situ preservation and will be the centerpiece of the proposed Historic Park.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT ANY REMOVAL OF CITRUS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF STREET WORK, SHALL REQUIRE THE APPROVAL OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION (CRANE/COFFMAN; CARRIED – 6 YEAS/0 NAYS/0 ABSTENSIONS/3 ABSENT)

16. Historic Mission Overlay District – The project is located within the Historic Mission Overlay District and would be subject to the requirements of the Ordinance. New development within the project area would be required to provide significant buffers around all historic structures. The character of a rural Mission Road would be maintained with either the original proposal, which would include a greenbelt, or the alternative plan, which would have large homes fronting Mission Road. The two parks proposed on Mission Road would also preserve the rural and historic character of Mission Road.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

17. Oak Grove – There are 43 coastal live oaks within the project site and the applicant has identified that 25 are healthy and worthy of being saved. The project proposes that every attempt will be made to preserve, in place or relocate the healthy trees. Also, if certain trees cannot be preserved, an approved replacement program would ensure the continuation of the grove. The Draft EIR, Pages 5.6-24 through 5.6-26 provide mitigation measures regarding the preservation, relocation, removal, replacement and inspections of the oaks by a specialist.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE TREES IN THE LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED RIGHT OF WAY, REMOVAL OR RELOCATION OF ANY OAK TREES SHALL REQUIRE HISTORICAL COMMISSION APPROVAL (STARK/COFFMAN; CARRIED – 6 YEAS/0 NAYS/0 ABSTENSIONS/3 ABSENT)

The Commission concluded its review and discussion of the University Village Project and made the following motion.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO THE CITY COUNCIL SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS AMENDED (COFFMAN/STARK; CARRIED – 5 YEAS/0 NAYS/1 ABSTENTION/3 ABSENT)

ORCHARD PARK SPECIFIC PLAN

On November 18, 2004, the Historical Commission held a public hearing on the Orchard Park Specific Plan Project and made the following recommendations as part of their approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

1. Mill Creek Zanja - Due to past floods in the area, the Zanja has been buried approximately four to seven feet below the current grade of the surface. The Zanja on Mission Road Report provides information on the location of the Zanja within University Village project area. The Zanja is located approximately 100 feet north of Mission Road and runs along almost parallel to Mission Road. The applicants propose an interpretive recreation of the Zanja from the west to the east boundaries of the project area. The Zanja would be identified with a trail that would include stone bollards, split rail fence, way-finding markers, shade trees, and benches. The applicant has proposed an alternative plan that would eliminate the Institutional use in PA13 and provide a park amenity instead. The Zanja trail could be an amenity in this park and continue east into the Mixed Use Planning Area 6.

MOTION TO REQUIRE THE REMOVAL OF THE LAST PARAGRAPH OF LUP III-15, AND TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE APPROVAL OF ALTERNATIVE NO. 2 AS A PARK (COFFMAN/RAMOS; CARRIED - 5 YEARS/0 DAYS/0 ABSTAINS/4 ABSENT)

2. San Bernardino Sonora Mission Road - Mission Road right-of-way will be improved in accordance to the design specifications approved by the City Council. The improvements include a center median and landscaping, except in front of existing residences. Mission Road would be realigned with Orange Street at the easterly portion of the project area. The remaining portion of Mission Road would be closed and a cul-de-sac developed. This would allow for residents living off of Mission Road to access their homes, but would not allow for through traffic to or from California.

MOTION TO REQUIRE SOME SIGNIFICANT ENTRY TREATMENT(S) THAT RECOGNIZES ORANGE AVENUE AS A GATEWAY INTO THE HMOD AND INCLUDES THE DISTRICT ENTRY MONUMENT SIGN; AND, TO REQUIRE THAT THE DESIGN AND COPY OF THE MONUMENT BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION (CRANE/COFFMAN; CARRIED - 5 YEARS/0 DAYS/0 ABSTAINS/4 ABSENT)

3. Hinckley Ranch Site – The location of the former ranch is in Planning Area 13. The three buildings previously located within the ranch were destroyed in a fire in 1999. There are three structural foundations found at this location. The applicant proposes to demolish the remaining foundations.

MOTION TO REQUIRE A MARKER (AN INTERPRETIVE SIGN SIMILAR TO THE INTERPRETIVE SIGN THAT WAS REQUIRED FOR THE MISSION SCHOOL SITE IN THE MISSION TRAILS PROJECT) THAT WOULD IDENTIFY ALL HMOD RESOURCES AT THIS LOCATION; AND, REQUIRE FURTHER ARCHEOLOGICAL SURVEY AND TESTING OF THE SITE, WHICH WOULD BE COMPLETED BY A LICENSED ARCHAEOLOGIST (COFFMAN/CRANE; CARRIED, 5 YEARS/0 DAYS/0 ABSTAINS/4 ABSENT)

4. 10684 California Street (Mission School) - The Mission School site is proposed for preservation in place and appropriate adaptive reuse that would be compatible with the proposed commercial land use. Preservation would include the central structure, bell tower, and oak grove and redwood/sequoias trees. Creative measures will be encouraged for the preservation of the WPA masonry wall in situ during design and construction of improvements to the California Street right-of-way.

MOTION TO REQUIRE THAT THE ORIGINAL STRUCTURES ASSOCIATED WITH THE SCHOOL BE PRESERVED IN SITU; THE REMOVAL OR RELOCATION OF ANY SIGNIFICANT TREES SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION; AND, TREES SHOULD BE KEPT IN THEIR ORIGINAL LOCATION OR IF NECESSARY, RELOCATED ON-SITE (COFFMAN/RAMOS; CARRIED - 5 YEAS/ 0 NAYS/0 ABSTAINS/4 ABSENT)

5. 10684 California Street (Curtis Residence) – This structure is owned by James Findlay and occupied by tenants. There is no proposal to alter the structure. Any future development on this lot would require Historical Commission review and City Council review and approval.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

6. 10852 California Street (Raymond Curtis House) - This structure is privately owned and occupied. There is no proposal to alter the structure. Any future development on this lot would require Historical Commission review and City Council review and approval.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

7. 25300 Mission Road (Nat Hinckley House) – This house is currently occupied by Inland Temporary Homes. Based on project plans the house is located within Planning Area 13, which is designated for institutional development. The alternative plan for a park in this location could possibly replace the plan for a church. The EIR states that the first priority would be to preserve this house in place, but if this is infeasible the structure should be studied for structural integrity and relocated within the district.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THE RESIDENCE BE RELOCATED AND INTEGRATED INTO THE HERITAGE PARK WITH THE INLAND TEMPORARY HOMES REOCCUPYING IT AFTER RELOCATION (CRANE/COFFMAN; CARRIED - 5 YEAS/ 0 NAYS/0 ABSTAINS/4 ABSENT)

8. 26472 Mission Road (Howard Vander Wall House) – This structure is privately owned and occupied. There is no proposal to alter the structure. Any future development on this lot would require Historical Commission review and City Council review and approval.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

9. 26391 Redlands Boulevard (Burned Adobe Residence) – This house has been completely burned and is currently boarded up. The adobe house is most likely to have been constructed in 1943. Based on project plans the house would be located within Planning Area 13, which is designated for commercial development. It is not considered a primary contributor to the district. The applicant is proposing to demolish this structure.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT THE STRUCTURE BE DOCUMENTED WITH PHOTOGRAPHS AND THAT ANY OF THE ADOBE BRICKS THAT CAN BE SALVAGED BE PRESERVED, USED ON-SITE, AND INTEGRATED INTO ON-SITE SITE AMENITIES SUCH AS LANDSCAPE TREATMENTS OR RELATED FEATURES (HODGKIN/COFFMAN; CARRIED - 5 YEAS/0 NAYS/0 ABSTAINS/4 ABSENT)

10. 26393 Redlands Boulevard (Cha Cha's Restaurant) – This structure is privately owned by Jack Hale and occupied by the restaurant owner. There is no proposal to alter the structure. Any future development on this lot would require Historical Commission review and City Council review and approval.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

11. 26397 Redlands Boulevard (Mission RV Park) – Mr. Jack Hale is the owner of the RV Park and here is no proposal to alter the structures or layout of the site. Any future development on this lot would require Historical Commission review and City Council review and approval.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

12. Mission Historic Overlay District - The project is located within the Mission Historic Overlay District and would be subject to the requirements of the Ordinance. New development within the project area would be required to provide significant buffers around all historic structures. The character of a rural Mission Road would be maintained with either the original proposal, which would include church site or the alternative plan, which would include a park site. Closing the east end of Mission Road with a cul-de-sac and realigning the through traffic onto Orange Street should reduce traffic to Mission Road and help preserve the rural character.

MOTION – None. The Commission agreed with the proposed treatment.

13. Oak Grove – Four live oak trees are identified on the Orchard Park project area within the coast live oak woodland (additional oaks are located in the Mission School site). The project proposes that every attempt will be made to preserve, in place or by relocating, the healthy trees. Also, if certain trees were unable to be preserved, an approved replacement program would ensure that the grove would continue. Pages 5.6-24 through 5.6-26 provide mitigation measures regarding the preservation, relocation, removal, replacement and inspections of the oaks by a specialist.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE TREES IN THE LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED RIGHT OF WAY, REMOVAL OR RELOCATION OF ANY OAK TREES SHALL REQUIRE HISTORICAL COMMISSION APPROVAL (CRANE/COFFMAN; CARRIED – 5 YEAS/0 NAYS/0 ABSTENSIONS/4 ABSENT)

The Commission concluded its review and discussion of the Orchard Park Project and made the following motion.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO THE CITY COUNCIL SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COFFMAN/CRANE; CARRIED - 5 YEAS/0 NAYS/0 ABSTAINS/4 ABSENT)

Regarding both the University Village and Orchard Park Projects, the Commission discussed their concern about the need to maintain a buffer to preserve the rural atmosphere along Mission Road as intended by the HMOD ordinance. The architecture of future development along Mission Road (and within the district) should be respectful of the historic nature of area.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT A BUFFER BE MAINTAINED ALONG MISSION ROAD TO PRESERVE THE RURAL ATMOSPHERE, AS INTENDED BY THE ORDINANCE (COFFMAN/CRANE; CARRIED, 5 YEAS/0 NAYS/0 ABSTAINS/4 ABSENT)

The Commission also discussed their shared concern that very high density should be eliminated and very low density should be added within the project area to ensure that the four points described in Section 3 (Intent) of the HMOD Ordinance are met.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

UNIVERSITY VILLAGE SPECIFIC PLAN

ORCHARD PARK SPECIFIC PLAN